IN THE HIGH COURT OF UTTARAKHAND AT NAINITAL

Writ Petition No. 89 of 2007 (S/B)

Ms. Manoj Bansal, Assistant Director,
Song & Drama Division
Ministry of Information and Broadcasting,
Nainital, Uttarakhand ..... Petitioner

Versus

1. Union of India through Secretary,
   Ministry of Information and Broadcasting,
   Shastri Bhawan, New Delhi.
2. Director, Song and Drama Division,
   Ministry of Information and Broadcasting.
   Soochna Bhawan, C.G.O. Complex,
   Lodhi Road, New Delhi.
3. Joint Director, Song and Drama Division,
   Ministry of Information and Broadcasting.
   Soochna Bhawan, C.G.O. Complex,
   Lodhi Road, New Delhi.
4. Deputy Director (Admn.),
   Song and Drama Division,
   Ministry of Information and Broadcasting.
   Soochna Bhawan, C.G.O. Complex,
   Lodhi Road, New Delhi.
5. Deputy Director, Song and Dram Division,
   Kendriya Bhawan, Ali Ganj, Lucknow.
6. Assistant Director (Admn.),
   Song and Drama Division,
   Ministry of Information and Broadcasting.
   Soochna Bhawan, C.G.O. Complex,
   Lodhi Road, New Delhi. ..... Respondents

.....

Sri Vikram Dutt, Advocate for the petitioner.
Sri Arvind Vashistha, Assistant Solicitor General for the respondents.

JUDGMENT

Coram: Hon'ble Rajeev Gupta, C.J.
Hon'ble J.C.S.Rawat, J.

RAJEEV GUPTA, C. J. (Oral)

Sri Vikram Dutt, Advocate for the petitioner.

Sri Arvind Vashistha, Assistant Solicitor General for the respondents.

2. Sri Arvind Vashistha, the learned Assistant Solicitor General has raised a preliminary, objection about the maintainability of the writ petition on the ground that the in view of the dictum of the Apex Court in the case of **L. Chandra Kumar Vs. Union of India and others** reported in **1997 (3) SCC 261,** no litigant can directly approach the High Court bypassing the 'Central Administrative Tribunal'.

3. In this view of the matter, Sri Vikram Dutt, the learned counsel for the petitioner seeks permission to withdraw the writ petition with the liberty of filing an Original Application before the Central Administrative Tribunal for the redressal of the grievances projected in the writ petition.

4. Permission granted.

5. With the above liberty, the writ petition is dismissed as withdrawn.

.

(J.C.S.Rawat, J.) **(Rajeev Gupta, C. J.)**
21.05.2007 21.05.2007

A